



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,710	06/12/2001	James N. Bates	P04852US0	3776
22885	7590	04/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. 801 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721				MELLER, MICHAEL V
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1655		

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/879,710

MAILED

Filing Date: June 12, 2001

APR 27 2006

Appellant(s): BATES ET AL.

GROUP 1600

Wendy Marsh
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the substitute appeal brief filed March 28, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed January 24, 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

4,772,591	Meisner	9-1988
3,892,852	Joullie et al.	7-1975

Chemical Abstracts Registry File Printout of S-methyl Cysteine, 2002.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meisner.

Meisner teaches that a composition containing among other ingredients, an anti-inflammatory substance, specifically, S-methylcysteine is administered to a patient, see abstract, col. 5, lines 3-27, col. 6, lines 6-8 and 57-67 and the claims. Even though the composition is administered to the patient for a different reason in the reference, it would have been inherent to the process of Meisner that nitric oxide synthesis is inhibited since the steps of the processes (Meisner and the instant application) are the same. All the process requires is that the S-methylcysteine is administered to a patient.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meisner taken with Joullie et al. and Chemical Abstracts Registry File Printout of S-methyl Cysteine.

Meisner teaches what is above. Meisner does not teach to inject the S-Methyl cysteine into a patient. Meisner also does not explicitly state that S-methylcysteine and S-methyl-L-cysteine are the same compound.

Joullie teaches that S-methyl cysteine is well known to be injected into an animal for therapeutic purposes, see column 10, lines 25-35, column 11, lines 30-45 and the claims.

Thus it would have been well within the purview of the skilled artisan to inject the S-methylcysteine composition of Meisner into a patient since as taught by Joullie it is well known to inject S-methyl cysteine for therapeutic purposes. Thus, it would have been well within the purview of the skilled artisan to inject the S-methyl cysteine since it is simply the choice of the artisan in an effort to optimize the desired results.

It is clear from the attached Chemical Abstracts Registry file print out that S-methylcysteine and S-methyl-L-cysteine are indeed the same compound.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellants argue that Meisner teaches a method which uses a composition which contains four substances, namely ascorbic acid, a precursor or stimulant of epinephrine or nor-epinephrine production such as tyrosine or phenylalanine (amino acids of which S-methyl cysteine is also an amino acid), calcium and a mild anti-inflammatory substance which can be S-methylcysteine.

Appellant argues that with the limitation "consisting essentially of" that the claim is limited and does not read on Meisner. Fact is, when one turns to appellants own specification they also include in their composition to be used besides calcium, excipients, stabilizers, antioxidants (which ascorbic acid is one), flavoring, effervescent agents, and the like, see specification page 4, first full paragraph. Appellants never explained on the record how their method's composition did not contain elements which materially changed the fundamental characteristics of the invention only that Meisner contained other elements and therefore their claims were excluded by "consisting essentially of". Appellant was reminded that unless they can show that the additional elements in Meisner materially changed the fundamental characterisitics of their invention then the composition of Meisner and that of the claims was one and the same because Meisner and the appellant disclosed administering the same S-methyl cysteine composition to a patient and that the additives in Meisner and that of appellant were

inconsequential absent evidence to the contrary which appellant never provided on the record. Appellant simply continued to reiterate that Meiser had more in it besides just S-methyl cysteine.

Appellant also argues that epinephrine or nor-epinephrine are well known vasoconstricting agents but Meisner was administering a precursor or stimulant of epinephrine or nor-epinephrine production such as tyrosine or phenylalanine (amino acids of which S-methyl cysteine is also an amino acid) not epinephrine or nor-epinephrine. Thus, the argument is without merit.

In the 35 USC 103 rejection, appellant argues again that epinephrine or nor-epinephrine are well known vasoconstricting agents but Meisner was administering a precursor or stimulant of epinephrine or nor-epinephrine production such as tyrosine or phenylalanine (amino acids of which S-methyl cysteine is also an amino acid) not epinephrine or nor-epinephrine. Thus, the argument is not understood. In fact these vasoconstricting agents could be amino acids which S-methylcysteine is. Thus, the arguments is without merit.

It is also noted that the claims never require the patient to suffer from anything, thus the argument that the invention is aimed at avoiding the side effects of vasoconstrictors is without merit since anyone according to the claims can be administered this composition claimed no matter what their need is.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael V. Meller
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655

April 7, 2006

Conferees:

Bruce Campell



BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Ponnathapu Achutamurthy


PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721